

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-15, 17-26, 28, 30-52, 56-66, 68-77, 79, and 81-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wen (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047297) in view of Boylan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,799,326).

As shown above, the claims have been amended. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 7-15, 18-26, 52, 56, 58-66, 69-77, and 103 are amended. Claims 2-4, 6, 16-17, 27-51, 53-55, 57, 67-68 and 78-102 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 104-124 are added. New claims 104-122 are directed towards computer-readable media counterparts of presented apparatus claims 56, 58-66 and 69-77. New claim 123 is directed towards an apparatus including "means for" elements that are counterparts to the elements of presented apparatus claim 52. New claim 124 recites features that were suggested by the Examiner during the telephonic interview conducted on September 14, 2011.

The section 103 rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1, 5, 7-15, 18-26, 52, 56, 58-66, 69-77, and 103 should be allowed over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed below.

As amended, independent claim 1 now recites:

1. A computer-implemented method for blocking advertisements, the method comprising:
 - referencing a primary advertisement within a web page;
 - identifying, based on referencing the primary advertisement within the web page, at least one blocking category of advertisements to be blocked and one or more terms that are relevant to the at least one blocking category;
 - accepting at least one advertisement as a candidate for a secondary advertisement within the web page that features the primary advertisement, with each accepted advertisement being configured to be embedded in the web page and being provided by an advertising server;
 - storing the at least one accepted advertisement on the advertising server for consideration in a list of candidates for the secondary advertisement;
 - identifying a document to which the at least one accepted advertisement is linked, the document representing a landing page related to the at least one accepted advertisement;
 - analyzing content in the document to identify one or more terms in the document;

comparing the one or more terms in the document to the one or more terms that are relevant to the at least one blocking category;
identifying, based on the comparing, whether the at least one accepted advertisement is in one or more of the at least one blocking category;
using the at least one blocking category of advertisements to be blocked to develop the list of the candidates for the secondary advertisement for placement with the primary advertisement, the candidates being selected from the at least one accepted advertisement for the secondary advertisement; and
preventing the at least one accepted advertisement from being included in the list of candidates if the at least one accepted advertisement is in one or more of the at least one blocking category of advertisements to be blocked.

The applied art, taken in any combination, is not understood to describe or to render obvious at least the foregoing underlined features of claim 1. For example, Wen describes advertisement selection based on “publisher’s permissible ad subcategories [and] advertiser’s elected ad categories or subcategories,” rather than based on the foregoing underlined features of claim 1.

Wen states:

At 690, when the ad broker receives an ad request, the ad broker system operates to match ads at 692 to determine which ad should be presented. Matching is performed by comparing a publisher's permissible ad subcategories against an advertiser's elected ad categories or subcategories. A subset of similar subcategories are generated. Then publisher denied ad subcategories are removed from consideration. In another embodiment, the publisher's minimum asking price is compared to the advertiser's maximum bid price and further selects ads where the publisher's minimum asking price is below the advertiser's maximum bid price. (Wen, para. 70).

As described in at least the foregoing passage, Wen’s system identifies a category of an advertisement based on an advertiser’s election of an “ad category.” In contrast, claim 1 recites using contents of a “document representing a landing page” in categorizing an advertisement. In particular, claim includes the features of “analyzing content in the document to identify one or more terms in the document; comparing the one or more terms in the document to the one or more terms that are relevant to the at least one blocking category; identifying, based on the comparing, whether the at least one accepted advertisement is in one or more of the at least one blocking category.”

Nowhere does Web describe or render obvious that its system performs the features of “comparing the one or more terms in the document to the one or more terms that are relevant to the at least one blocking category; identifying, based on comparing, whether the at least one accepted advertisement is in one or more of the at least one blocking category.” Rather than using one or more terms in a landing page for an advertisement in identifying whether Wen’s advertisement is one of the “publisher denied ad subcategories,” Wen describes that an advertiser specifies and/or selects a category for the advertisement and that Wen’s system compares the advertiser selected category to the “publisher denied ad subcategories” to determine whether an advertisement may be presented.

The Examiner relies on Boylan as allegedly teaching the storing feature of claim 1. Applicant does not concede this. Further, Boylan, taken alone or in any combination with Wen, does not cure the deficiencies of Wen discussed above.

For at least any or all of these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 based on the applied art taken in any combination should be withdrawn. Independent claim 52 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1, and therefore the rejection of this claim should be likewise withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. Independent claim 103 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1, and therefore the rejection of this claim should be likewise withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. The rejection of dependent claims 5, 7-15, 18-26, 56, 58-66 and 69-77 should be withdrawn for at least reasons similar to those presented above for the claims on which claims 5, 7-15, 18-26, 56, 58-66 and 69-77 depend. The timely allowance of claims 1, 5, 7-15, 18-26, 52, 56, 58-66, 69-77, and 103 is accordingly requested.

New dependent claims 104-122 include limitations similar to those in claims 56, 58-66 and 69-77. New claims 104-122 should be allowed over the applied art for at least reasons similar to those presented for claims 56, 58-66 and 69-77. The timely allowance of new claims 104-122 is thus requested.

New independent claim 123 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1. New claim 123 should be allowed over the applied art for at least reasons similar to those presented for claim 1. The timely allowance of new claim 123 is thus requested.

New independent claim 124 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1. New claim 124 should be allowed over the applied art for at least reasons similar to those presented in connection with claim 1. The timely allowance of new claim 124 is thus requested.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

The required fee for the Petition for Extension of Time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account Authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 16113-0768001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 7, 2011

/ Christina V. McDonough/
Christina V. McDonough
Reg. No. 64,612

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945